DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 944 SO 014 920

AUTHOR Fernekes, William R.
TITLE The Uses and Abuses of Oral History as an Instructional Technique in Social Studies Education.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983). Print type marginally legible.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Critical Thinking; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Practices; Educational Research; *Ethnic Studies; *Instructional Improvement; *Oral History; Secondary Education; *Social Studies; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

To determine how oral history techniques are used in secondary level ethnic studies courses, and to make suggestions for improvement, 40 questionnaires were mailed to selected schools listed in directories of cultural journalism. The return rate was 33%. Results showed that oral history is used as an instructional technique by experienced teachers (minimum of 7 years in the classroom). However, most of the teachers do not utilize how-to-do-it manuals for oral history training; those who do usually use Foxfire materials and there is a lack of knowledge among the practitioners about non-Foxfire models. The instructors do not use critical approaches to teaching ethnic studies. Their two major objectives for using oral history are to transmit cultural heritage and to develop the personal-social understanding of students, not to challenge the status quo or to encourage the development of alternative approaches to historical understanding that might assist people in challenging consensus interpretations of the past. Teachers should educate themselves concerning the oral history techniques and research to become aware of how their frames of reference mesh with their chosen models of usage for oral history, and to show students how to think critically. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William R. Fernekes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Uses and Abuses of Oral History As An Instructional Technique In Social Studies Education

William R. Fernekes
Graduate School of Education
Department of Science and Humanities Education
Rutgers University

Presented as part of a symposium sponsored by the Special Interest Group/Research in Social Studies Education of the American Educational Research Association at the AERA annual meeting, Montreal, Canada, April 1983. Session 43.33: "Ethnic Oral History: Methodological, Philosophical, and Curricular Concerns." Printed in U. S. A.

Pre-publication copy: no reproduction without author's written permission.

SO CY 920

RUTGERS
THE STATE UNIVERSITY
OF NEW JERSEY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION • 10 SEMINARY PLACE • NEW BRUNSWICK • NEW JERSEY 08903

Abstract

Connections between secondary instruction in oral history techniques and ethnic studies curricula are emphasized. Three purposes are served. First, oral history is described as a popular innovation in social studies instruction. Four models of usage are described: (1) the improvement of instruction in history, (2) the preservation of endangered primary source materials, (3) increasing the potential for affective learning, and (4) aiding in the development of particular cognitive skills and processes. Second, data on oral history programs in thirteen secondary schools is analyzed in light of (1) the model of usage put into practice by each program, and (2) how each program assists in the teaching of ethnic studies content and concepts. Third, conclusions and recommendations for the practice of school oral history are offered, specifically directed to highlighting problems in oral history in the schools, and to improving its practice in conjunction with ethnic studies curricula. Problems include a lack of knowledge among practitioners about diverse models of oral history usage; little understanding concerning the processes of historical memory; and an uncritical approach to the teaching of ethnic studies. Suggestions for improvement emphasize greater knowledge among teachers of literature in oral history techniques and research; increased awareness of how teacher frames of reference mesh with their chosen models of usage for oral history; and use of critical approaches to teaching ethnic studies curricula that combine ethnic awareness with the problematic consideration of ethnicity's role in American society. The school survey instrument is appended.

The Uses and Abuses of Oral History as an Instructional Technique in Social Studies Education

The use of oral history with ethnic studies in social studies classrooms is growing throughout the United States. One popular variation, the Foxfire model, has grown from a small high school in Georgia to well over eighty projects in a period of fifteen years (Hatcher, 1980). The number of manuals advocating the use of oral history in schools continues to proliferate, notably those published by agencies of state governments and both public and private research libraries and bodies (Hayden, 1979; Meyer, et al, 1980: National Council for the Social studies, 1979; Pennsylvania State Department of Education, 1975; San Francisco Public Library, 1977). Another indication of this continuing popularity is the regular appearance of articles in professional journals addressing the topic of oral history in the classroom. It has been discussed with some frequency as a worthwhile instructional innovation for the social studies in the following journals: Clearing House (1975); The Social Studies (1976, 1977, 1979, 1981); and Social Education (1968, 1977, 1979).

In particular, oral history as an instructional technique has been used in conjunction with ethnic studies curricula. This union has proven useful, but is fraught with difficulties. This article presents the findings of a study on current oral history projects in thirteen schools, assesses the overall aims served by the use of oral history in social studies curricula, and finally evaluates the ethnic studies dimensions in light of recent scholarship on oral history and ethnicity.

---

[1]The author kindly acknowledges the assistance of the following individuals in the preparation of this paper: Howard Green and Giles Wright of the New Jersey Historical Commission, and Allen Howard of the Rutgers University-New Brunswick History Department.

Oral history is a relatively new field but practitioners are sharply divided over content and techniques. Some consider oral history to be an interview situation where the interviewer questions an informant in order to systematically, collect, arrange, preserve, and publish recorded verbatim accounts and opinions of people who were witnesses or participants to events of the past (Moss, 1976). At the other end of the spectrum, certain practicioners contend that oral history encompasses not only systematic interviews, but also any orally transmitted communications which have been intentionally preserved to serve future generations. This broad definition includes items such as the Watergate Tapes, collections of folksongs and legends gathered by anthropologists, the taped speeches and discussions of the Montreal AERA meeting, and even compilations of radio broadcasts, such as the famous description by announcer Russ Hodges of Bobby Thompson's ninth inning homerun in the 1951 National League baseball playoff game.

No one approach is appropriate for every school. Rather, educators should select which forms best serve their overall curricular and instructional goals. For example, using oral history to gether Native American legends and folklore suggests a rather broad definition of the term "oral history," since many times a question and answer dialogue is not necessary or desired to elicit this type of information, or it may actually fail to do so. Folklorists and anthropologists have long focused on collection of orally transmitted data, while historians and sociologists have more often emphasized conversational interviewing in their investigations. Students who are asked to compare written interpretations of historical events with the remembrances of elderly eyewitnesses typically use numerous questions to focus and guide the conversations according to their research agenda.

In this paper, oral history geared to classroom instruction includes four interrelated and essential elements.

1. A planned instructional strategy exists for the training of students in four specific areas: (a) pre-interview preparation, (b) interviewing, (c) the analysis of orally communicated data, and (d) the future usage of taped data.

2. Tape recorders and tapes are used for the preservation of orally communicated data.

3. An interactive spoken dialogue exists between a person who acts as the interviewer, and one who acts as the informant. The interviewer questions and offers cues in spoken form, while the informant responds to questions and cues in narrative form.

4. Future usage of the taped data as source material by teachers, students, and other individuals or groups is intended.

Growth and Development of Oral History Instruction in Schools

Oral history as a research technique was formally institutionalized on a systematic scale at Columbia University by the historian Allan Nevins in the late 1940s (Starr, 1977). Although systematic interviewing in a historical dimension had occurred prior to this, particularly under the auspices of the Works Progress Administration during the 1930s (Blassingame, 1977), it was only when tape recording became convenient and portable that interest in oral history burgeoned.

Oral history in the schools was given tremendous impetus by the development of portable and relatively inexpensive cassette technology in the late 1960s. Articles about the use of oral history in schools began to appear by 1968 (Morrissey, 1968). Coincidentally, the development of an easy-to-use technology occurred simultaneously with the renewed interest among university and secondary level educators in the reformation of the secondary social studies curriculum.

Furthermore, the educational reforms which took hold in the 1960s and 1970s also promoted the use of oral history in the curriculum. For one thing, Jerome Bruner and others forcefully advocated a structure of the disciplines approach which aligned the secondary school curriculum with the academic disciplines of the university and which stressed "discovery learning" (Brunner, 1977; Haas, 1977). The research methods of university scholars were stressed as the preferred instructional models for students in social studies classes, including among these oral history. Second, student-centered learning flourished, and oral history was suited because it requires active student participation and because it focuses on the affective domain. Oral history interviewing permits the student interviewer and community informant to participate in a reciprocal sharing of information. This process can facilitate a heightened understanding of the elderly and of other cultures by students, as well as contribute to the real-life application of social studies concepts and inquiry methods. Third, oral history meshed well with the problems/processes approach (Haas, 1977) because it offered students an opportnnity to gather useful data about social issues and problems. This aided students in relating their in-school attempts at critical reflection to the lived experiences of community informants who were participants in such problems as warfare, civil rights agitation, or preservation projects. Finally, oral history was consistent with the growth of revisionist, non-consensus history research and writing, a perspective generated in part by the civil rights and anti-Vietnam war movements and in part by a model going back to Dewey, for relevancy based on the linkage between curricular content and student life experiences (Dewey, 1959). As a reaction to the consensus interpretation of history, a new social history emerged in the late 1960s, examining what some observers labeled as the underside of American history--

the history of oppressed groups, of dissidents, of women, and of the family. Oral history was used extensively by university historians and social scientists to delve into these formerly neglected aspects of American culture (Lynd and Lynd, 1973; Hareven and Langenbach, 1978; Nee and Nee, 1972; Montell, 1970). Given student disinterest in transmission approaches to learning social studies, methods such as oral history gained new credibility. Kownslar summarized the importance of the student-centered approach in the 1974 National Council for the Social Studies Yearbook.

> Emphasis during the Sixties on concept development and acquisition of a mode of inquiry therefore supported the contention that a study of history or any discipline with the social studies can be relevant to students; that, as John Dewey long ago argued, the best academic discipline for the child comes from one which taps first his actual experiences and progresses into an examination of related examples from the past. Through such a process, learning a historical "fact" or concept enabled students to use it functionally to find out other facts and meanings of a concept, or, more fundamentally, to learn something more about themselves or their society. (Kownslar, 1974, p. 7).

By doing oral history students actually could add to the body of existing information by gathering data on groups often ignored in the texts ("more history"), and could also contribute to the reinterpretation process ("new history"). Oral history, as part of the "new" social studies, became an instructional innovation that had multiple justifications.

Applications of Oral History in the Classroom

Four distinct justifications emerge from the professional literature concerning the application of oral history in classrooms.

History instruction. Oral history is touted as a means to expand the definition of what is labeled legitimate historical knowledge, or legitimate topics into which students can inquire (Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981, Mazuzan and Twomey, 1977; Mehaffy, Sitton and Davis, Jr., 1979; Nelson and Singleton, 1975; Purkis, 1980; Thompson, 1978). Local and community history is argued to have increased relevance for students because it places the student's own environment and cultural milieu at the center of investigation, with the implication that the students will be heavily motivated to inquire about that which is most readily identifiable to him (Allen and Montell, 1982; Crowder, 1967; Lichtman, 1977; Mazuzan and Twomey, 1977; Purkis, 1980; Thompson, 1978). Third, oral history is recommended as a technique which has the potential to fill gaps in an imcomplete historical record. This approach is often linked to the study of local and community history, in addition to the concerns of archivists and historians who contend that the amplification of existing source materials is an excellent means for encouraging a broader interpretation of history (Allen and Montell, 1982; Baum, 1971; Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981; Mazuzan and Twomey, 1977; Morrissey, 1968; Nelson and Singleton, 1975; Purkis, 1980; Thompson, 1978; Wright, Note 1). Fourth, it is argued that students who learn the use of oral history techniques are able to participate intimately in the actual processes of historical research. This claim was made by the structure of the disciplines advocates through the "inquiry" approach (Fenton, 1967), but with oral history it is usually restricted to the examination and use of historical method (Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981; Nelson and

Singleton, 1975, Thompson, 1978). The claim for this approach is frequently tied to the combined use of both oral and written documents in interpreting history, instead of using oral sources in isolation. Fifth, oral history is suggested as a technique that is appropriate for generating popular participation in the reinterpretation of a broader and more populist historical record (Frisch, 1981; Green, 1981; Purkis, 1980; Thompson, 1978). This tradition is particularly strong in Great Britain, given its strong heritage of trade union activism and worker education. Its influence in the United States has been disseminated through the work of Paul Thompson, notably in his book The Voice of the Past: Oral History. Finally, as a result of the preceding justifications, some authors suggest that the use of oral history can produce renewed student interest in studying history itself (Benison, 1965; Crowder, 1969; Ilisevich, 1972; Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981; Mazuzan and Twomey, 1977). Declining history enrollments and lack of interest in social studies instruction by students inspired these advocates to argue that oral history projects on topics of current interest, such as the Vietnam War and the history of the family, could motivate students to find in history what their teachers believe is necessary for greater understanding of society.

Archival Preservation. Oral history is regularly discussed by archivists, librarians, and scholars as a means for adding to the store of primary source materials available for instruction and research. A number of authors also recommend this approach to teachers as a way of using oral history in the classroom (Allen and Montell, 1982; Crowder, 1967; Mazuzan and Twomey, 1977; Mehaffy, Sitton, and Davis, Jr., Nelson and Singleton, 1975; Newton, 1973; Purkis, 1980; Thompson, 1978). Three subcategories exist within this justification: (a) oral history as a

means of rescuing neglected aspects of culture from irrevocable loss, (b) oral history as a means for creating primary source documents for classroom use, and (c) oral history as a means to provide more intimate and microscopic views of events usually portrayed from a long-range perspective. By creating tape archives and storing tapes for future use in schools, students and teachers acquaint their peers with a new source of content for investigations. Purkis (1980) contends that either print or audio-visual uses of the taped memoirs can be created by students, such as slide shows with taped interviews highlighting the visual images. Allen and Montell (1982) believe that the characteristically grand perspective on history of the detached scholar does not provide the uniqueness of the eyewitness account to historical change. The Foxfire projects suggest a vivid example of how Appalachian life emerges as a living but endangered way of life due to the use of eyewitness accounts of local culture, rather than as a statistical abstraction or a quaint curiosity (Wiggonton, 1979).

Affective Learning. Oral history helps participants develop increased empathy, respect, and understanding regarding diverse groups, including the elderly, cultural and ethnic minorities, and the many formal and informal community networks which are often ignored in the formal school curriculum. By engendering contact between youth and elderly residents on a basis of reciprocity, oral history is seen as a means to facilitate intergenerational understanding (Baum, 1971; Cutler, Echols, Gallant, and Wiggonton, 1973; Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981; Purkis, 1980). Oral history can also facilitate intercultural understanding (Cutler, Echols, Gallant, and Wiggonton, 1973; Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981; Nelson and Singleton, 1975; Peterson, 1973; Purkis, 1980; Thompson, 1978). Many oral history projects involve interviews with members of cultural

and ethnic minorities, and learning by students with members of minority groups is claimed to remove attitudinal barriers to cooperation and dialogue. Thompson (1978) suggests that the isolation of the activities done in schools from the daily life of communities contributes to the alienation of youth from their own past. When students are rarely involved in examining the everyday processes of work, they have difficulty in understanding how workers view their daily experiences. Additionally, because they are divorced from the reality of the workplace, youth entering the workforce have difficulty in becoming active creators of their own culture, interpreters of their own past, or establishing identification with their co-workers based on common cultural bonds. Thompson envisions oral history as a means for engendering school-community cooperation for the discovery of common linkages between students and workers, in the hope engendering an understanding can develop regarding how both groups can become culturally active now and in the future.

Cognitive Skills and Processes. It is claimed that oral history is a worthwhile classroom technique for learning social science skills and literacy skills (Kachaturoff and greenebaum, 1981: Sullivan, 1974). Skills such as developing concise and provocative questions, designing a research plan, inferring from interview data, editing transcripts according to accepted literary standards, and developing an organized and systematic approach to gathering data are representative of this approach. Wiggonton (1975) contends that the Foxfire concept includes a four level stage of skills development tied to affective learning goals.

1. Students gain skills and confidence by actively learning how to write, edit, interview, and complete related publication tasks under the guidance of teachers who structure the environment to facilitate skills acquisition.

2. Intensification of skills acquisition by students reinforces the first stage, while helping the student look beyond himself to the needs of others.

3. Student sharing of knowledge and skills results in peer learning, while team-teaching with other students stresses a sensitive awareness of others.

4. Independence of the student emerges as he looks beyond his local environment and network of associates, permitting the student to orient his focus towards the future.

The belief that oral history can assist in developing independence and and a healthy self-concept is the most singular element of the Foxfire learning model (Cutler, Echols, Gallant and Wiggonton, 1973; Mack, 1976; Peterson, 1973; Hamilton, 1980; Wiggonton, 1975). The increased focus on the student's learning agenda can result in greater interest in learning social studies content and concepts as a spinoff from student centered learning (Kachaturoff and Greenebaum, 1981; Spade, 1975).

Observations on Classroom Usage of Oral History

While many authors believe oral history contributes to positive learning outcomes, the relationships between their claims and actual classroom usage must be examined. Forty surveys were mailed to selected schools in the United States requesting information about how oral history and ethnic studies curricula are related in existing curricula. The sample of schools was compiled from lists published in directories of cultural journalism projects (Nameless Newsletter, 1977; Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1975; Whistler, 1977; Hayden, 1979; Meyer, et al, 1980; Hatcher, 1980). Geographic and ethnic diversity was sought with surveys directed to schools in all geographic regions of the U.S.A., including Alaska and Hawaii. The selection of schools was also based upon clues suggested in project titles concerning potential ethnic emphases in school curricula. For example,

Legado, a Spanish-titled magazine published in Miami, Florida, seemed to have a large ethnic studies content. Finally, the author's previous correspondence with magazine editors and course instructors added to the list of those surveyed.

Thirteen completed surveys were returned, comprising a 33 percent return rate (13 of 39). One survey was returned unopened, while three others were returned uncompleted for diverse reasons. Twenty-six surveys were mailed and never returned. Reasons suggested for the relatively low return rate are: (a) projects which produce magazines often persist only if available financial resources, enrollments, and interested faculty remain in a school (Hatcher, 1980), (b) faculty may not have time to complete lengthy and detailed survey instruments, and (c) the schools in the survey sample may no longer have oral history/ethnic studies curricula due to changes in local curricular offerings.

Analysis of Survey Data.[2] The evidence available is shown in tables corresponding to different clusters of survey questions. Narrative responses are discussed in the text, and questions requiring narrative responses are noted therein. Due to the low return rate, all conclusions are regarded as suggestive of larger trends, rather than authoritative indications of existing patterns of pedagogy and curricular innovation.

Instructors Surveyed

Table 1

Questions One-Four

Questions	n[a]	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
1	13	1	0	3	3	3	3		
2	13	8	5						
3	14	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	1
4	13	1	1	0	7	1	3	0	

[a]Thirteen surveys were returned, and in all questions except for eleven and twelve, respondents were requested to mark one answer. In questions three, five, eight, and seventeen, some respondents marked more than one answer.

[2]A complete survey questionnaire is appended, see pages 41-47.

The majority of the respondents are experienced teachers with a minimum of seven years in the classroom. Eight of the thirteen are male, five are female, and three of thirteen are department chairpersons. For virtually all the respondents, oral history has been part of their instructional repertoire for five years or more.

One concludes that experienced teachers use oral history as an instructional technique. Having once tried it, they keep using it. Classroom teachers, rather than department chairpersons, incorporate oral history into their courses, probably on their own initiative rather than because their superior suggested it. More research is needed on the question of how oral history finds its way into the curriculum. Also, oral history emerges as an attractive innovation for experienced teachers, who do not appear reluctant to experiment with it well into their careers.

Place in the Curriculum

Table 2

Questions Five, Six, and Eight

Questions	n[b]	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i
5	17	6	2	3	1	2	0	3	0	0
6	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
8	13	5	8							

Table 3

Question Seven

		Number of Weeks						
Question	n	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-36
7	13	4	2	1	1	0	0	5

[b]See footnote for Table 1.

Interestingly, instructors in several other areas also found it valuable. Furthermore, because nearly all courses employing oral history were year-long (thirty-two weeks or more), and most teachers devoted a quarter or more of the class time to it suggests a high level of commitment. This is substantiated by the fact that nearly all the respondents stated that the oral history element was a major element in the class (seven cases) or equal in importance to other elements (three cases).

It is clear that oral history is not strictly a "social studies" instructional technique, given its appeal to instructors in other areas of the curriculum, such as fine arts and English/language arts. The use of oral history in conjunction with skill instruction in writing, reading, and graphics can account for this cross-disciplinary trend. Broad social goals, including the improvement of student self-concepts, assistance in the growth of student intercultural understanding, and the development of cooperative/sharing attitudes among students make oral history an attractive cross-disciplinary option.

Oral history is utilized over extensive periods of time in the classroom, suggesting that the training of students for the use of this technique can not be done effectively within brief units of instruction. Likewise, the majority of instructors view oral history as a major curricular element, or of equal importance to other elements. Most instructors devote considerable amounts of time to oral history, with at least one quarter or more of classroom time concentrating on oral history instruction, or using oral history in conjunction with other topics. Oral history is seen as a highly valued element related to the eventual success of the surveyed courses.

Oral History Training

Table 4

Questions Nine, Eleven, Twelve, and Thirteen

Questions	n[c]	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j
9	13	5	8								
11	13[d]	9	8	4	6	6	4	6	11	9	9
12	11[e]	5	6	7	5	6	5	8	6	1	
13	13	10	3								

Questions		k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	s	t	u
11	13[d]	11	5	8	10	9	10	9	9	11	8	6

[c]See footnote a for Table 1

[d]Question eleven requested respondents to mark as many alternatives as were applicable to their program.

[e]Question twelve requested respondents to mark as many alternatives as were applicable to their program.

Most instructors (eight of thirteen) do not employ how-to-do-it manuals for oral history training. Those who do usually employ materials developed by the Foxfire Fund (Wood, 1975; Wiggonton, 1972, 1975), or locally developed cultural journalism publications (Woburn, H. S., Notes 2 and 3).

Responses to question eleven reveal that of the twenty training procedures listed, fifteen are employed by at least seven of the thirteen respondents. This does not reveal the amount of time devoted in courses to each specific procedure, nor does it provide data on which procedure is deemed most significant in the training process. Nevertheless, the programs surveyed emphasize eight phases of oral history training. These include: (a) interviewing, (b) transcribing taped interviews, (c) editing of transcripts, (d) usage of legal release forms, (e) developing informant contacts, (f) proper equipment usage, (g) preservation and future usage of completed interviews (tapes, release forms, and transcripts), and (h) background research in documents and artifacts prior to beginning the interview process.

The dominant procedures are (a) practice in questioning, (b) practice in transcription, and (c) reading and discussion of interviewing problems. Less frequently emphasized are (a) reading and discussion of sources on indexing and editing, (b) analysis of other oral history projects and research, (c) listening to and discussing previously completed interview

tapes, and (d) practice in indexing interviews. Miscellaneous additional training procedures encompass (a) using local historians and interviewing experts as resource persons, (b) employing previous students as resource persons, and (c) analyzing student publications as sources for interviews and related research.

Concerning post-interview activities, six of eleven instructors indicate that students engage in critiques of interviews, transcripts, and interviewers, evaluation of the worth of oral history tapes and related documents from previous years, and evaluation of the value of completed interviews as sources for research topics. Less popular are (a) listening to and critiquing completed interview tapes, (b) evaluation of the worth of oral history as an instructional technique, and (c) having colleagues judge the worth of oral history in instruction.

Maintaining archives of completed tapes and related documents is a high priority and in two cases the archives are a shared responsibility with cooperating universities. Most archives reside in instructor classrooms, and public access is the rule rather than the exception. A minority (five) maintain catalogues of interviews, and even less note that completed tapes are indexed and/or labeled.

It appears that a wide knowledge of the available materials for oral history training is lacking. The most well-known individual author cited is Eliot Wiggonton, through the use of the Foxfire learning materials. No mention of the publications of the Oral History Association, of the Oral History Society of Great Britain, or of the numerous manuals, monographs, and journal articles written by active oral historians, researchers, and students is evident.

Training of students emphasizes hands-on, active participation rather than reflective thought about existing research models for oral history.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instructors emphasize practice in the actual interviewing process, including questioning, contacting informants, and proper equipment usage. Additionally, transcription, editing, and preservation of completed tapes is usually part of these courses. The emphasis placed by instructors on training students in oral history also includes some background research prior to int-rviewing in existing print documents. Oral history interviewing is not identified as the sole source of research data.

There is a lack of concern for analysis of existing models of oral history as published in books, articles, and evidenced in other school projects, suggesting that a sufficient knowledge of different approaches in the field is lacking. Although the Foxfire model is financially successful and popular, it is not the only model for oral history in the schools, nor has Foxfire been immune from criticism (Perdue, 1979). The extent to which the respondents know about the various models presented in this paper seems to be dependent on instructor reading habits, and a disposition to experiment with different instructional approaches. It is not clear that the instructors surveyed are awa e of non-Foxfire models for oral history in schools, and further research to clarify their breadth of knowledge is required.

Data on post-interview activities suggests that evaluation is not a high priority focus of these courses. Little more than half of the instructors state that students do engage in some evaluative activities. It is unclear at this time whether such evaluations are extensive or minimal, and further research is needed to clarify this point.

The archival preservation model appears to be of some importance for the surveyed programs. Not only is further usage of tapes by the public expected, but students may be actively involved in the preservation processes of indexing, labeling, and cataloguing the completed interviews, much in the manner of professional librarians and archivists. If this is the case, the archival preservation model is wedded to the cognitive skills and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

processes mod l to some degree. Future research should address the extent to which the two models are united in practice: specifically, identifying how much training students actually receive in preservation processes, and how their cognitive skills of organizing, writing, and related skills are improved.

Oral History: Links to Social Studies Aims and Ethnic Studies

Table 5

Questions Fifteen and Seventeen

Questions	n[f]	a	b	c	d	e	f
15	13[g]	8	1	3	0	9	2
17	12	4	1	4	3		

[f]See footnote a in Table 1.

[g]Respondents were asked to mark one alternative for question fifteen, but some indicated more than one alternative as their answer to this question.

Two rationales predominate for oral history usage in surveyed courses: (a) transmission of the cultural heritage, and (b) development of personal-social understanding of students. Much less important are (a) development of critical thinking or inquiry skills (three responses), and (b) introduction and training in the social science disciplines (one response). No instructor mentioned the development of social critics and social activists. Two miscellaneous rationales (developing the self-awareness of students, and collection and preservation of West Virginia heritage) completed this section.

Self-stated goals of oral history instruction (question sixteen) stress affective learning (thirteen responses); encompassing increased intercultural and intergenerational understanding, greater intra-community understanding, and heightened student self-awareness and maturity. Somewhat

less popular is the cognitive skills and processes model (six responses); including the development of content area skills, research skills, and foreign language competency skills. Few goals are attributed to either the history instruction (one response), or archival preservation (two responses) models.

Knowledge of one's cultural heritage in a more thorough and intimate manner is the most noticeable benefit of oral history, according to instructor replies to question eighteen (three of five responses). Other responses ranged from learning about values and how the school and community are linked, to the study of Afro-American and Hispanic culture. In any case, these are minor in comparison (all received only one response).

Ten of thirteen instructors responded to question nineteen, while only four of thirteen answered question twenty. Instructors believe that affective learning is clearly the most worthwhile result of oral history instruction when used with ethnic studies. The range of affective outcomes include: (a) heightened student self-awareness of their own social histories, (b) recognizing the importance of learning for its own sake, (c) increasing students' sense of self-worth, (d) expansion of intercultural and intergroup understanding, and (e) discovering universal truths about life processes such as aging. Less important outcomes are associated with (a) learning knowledge related to the cultural heritage of ethnic groups, and (b) the development of cognitive skills and processes, among them writing skills and foreign language skills. Negative outcomes accruing from oral history/ethnic studies linkages include (a) an inability to motivate alienated students, (b) failure to successfully perpetuate a local history project, (c) lack of collegial support by school staff, and (d) misdirected praise for school administrators accruing from an award-winning publication.

Clearly, the majority of instructors are wedded to a non-controversial model of oral history usage. Transmission of the cultural heritage has traditionally not challenged the prevailing networks of socioeconomic, political, and cultural power, nor has it encouraged the development of alternative approaches to historical understanding which might assist people in challenging consensus interpretations of the past (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977). While oral history aids the capacity of youth to identify with their elders and reconstruct their heritage along ethnic lines, it does not encourage the development of a critical and questioning attitude about the type of heritage which is being transmitted, or whether that heritage is either truthful or representative of the range of human experiences in a particular community. The uncritical transmission of a narrowly-defined heritage may ignore other tools of historical and societal analysis by placing an inordinate emphasis on ethnicity. Class, work, and gender can be used to dissect the historical past, to analyze the present, and to make predictions about the future. Transmitting the cultural heritage can simply perpetuate a consensus historical vision which utilizes a multicultural framework devoid of fundamental concepts such as class and gender in conjunction with ethnicity in helping students reformulate their identities.

Equally important to the instructors surveyed is the rationale labeled "development of personal-social understanding of students." This broadly-defined rationale encompasses areas such as the cultural awareness of one's own identity when this is viewed as necessary for developing a sound self-concept. The Foxfire learning model most cogently epitomizes this rationale in practice. Contributing to this rationale's importance are the majority of instructional goals listed by

the instructors, which predominate in the area of affective learning. In context, oral history emerges as part of a broad-based action learning strategy. The two principal benefits for students of action learning are: (a) the development of a sense of industry and identity by focusing on tasks that the students see as relevant to their own lives, and (b) the fostering of psychological maturation processes through the immersion of students in experiences that facilitate role experimentation with varied types of people (Mehaffy, Atwood, and Nelson, 1981, p. 194). The processes used in classroom oral history instruction are seen as a means to a larger end, that being the development of more self-assured, tolerant, and self-aware young adults. It is doubtful that the experienced educators surveyed would contend that these goals are achievable unless oral history has a unique capacity to realize such goals. It also is doubtful they would devote considerable amount of instructional time to oral history if positive social benefits for students did not result. Finally, oral history is believed to contribute to the development of cognitive skills and processes in students. Such learning is congruent with the cultural transmission and personal-social development rationales. Mastery of particular skills, such as listening, writing, and reading, is mentioned in conjunction with one or the other rationale by five of the thirteen instructors. Respondents believe that many goals served by oral history encompass a range of both affective and cognitive outcomes. This trend conforms to the findings of Mehaffy, Atwood, and Nelson (1981) that in action learning, "There must be a connection between instruction in the classroom and life outside of the classroom," and "such experiences must be coupled with reflection on the experience" (p. 201). As a component

of action learning, oral history links the development of skills typically learned in school with affective learnings engendered in non-school settings. However, reflection about oral history does not appear to be extensive in the surveyed courses, particularly regarding evaluation of its worth as an instructional technique.

Oral History and Ethnic Studies Curricula: Problems and Prospects

Teachers need to ask themselves two fundamental questions when contemplating the use of oral history as an instructional technique: (a) Why am I using oral history rather than another instructional technique?, and (b) How is my agenda regarding the ultimate aims of social studies education served by using oral history in the classroom? If teachers are going to commit time and effort to have students use oral history with ethnic studies content and concepts, what positive and negative outcomes for teachers, students, and society may result?

Problems

Teachers need to examine their own assumptions and biases regarding the nature of history. Oral history is a technique whose use raises difficult, but unavoidable issues concerning the type of history one seeks to create. Oral history can be employed to refute or corroborate existing print documents and audio-visual sources; indeed, this is the thrust of many historians who use oral history (Morrissey, 1980; Moss, 1977; Tamke, 1977). It appears that such an approach takes a rather non-critical stance concerning the gathering of data, since the predominant goal is simply gathering more data. The underlying assumption of such inquiry is the description and interpretation of <u>what actually occurred</u> in the past. Social studies teachers, by and large trained in

the tradition of scientific verification and biased towards the supposedly greater validity of print documents, gravitate to this corroborative emphasis when justifying the use of oral history. Advocates of improved history instruction through oral history view the corroborative emphasis as a means to augment the written record, a goal that is congruent with assisting particular groups in "finding" their own past. This occurs with groups who under other circumstances might leave no record at all of their past, or whose history has been narrowly interpreted due to a paucity of written documents. This archival preservation justification is based on the same corroborative emphasis; that increased accessibility of humans to historical sources permits more precise description and interpretation of the historical record (what actually occurred). Oral history as a corroborative process, either to improve history instruction or to preserve newly found archival materials, represents Paul Thompson's notion of "more history" (Thompson, 1978).

However, learning what actually occurred should not be the sole use of oral history instruction. The uniqueness of oral history exists precisely in its potential to facilitate a cooperative approach to creating history (Frisch and Watts, 1980). Oral history interviews represent the creation of history through the interaction of interview and informant in a cooperative dialogue (Benison, 1965). Frisch's "Oral History and Hard Times: A Review Essay" (1979) views the process of oral history not as the verification or corroboration of an objective historical record, but as the interaction of memory and culture. Frisch sees the focus of oral history as consciousness, and by engaging

in oral history as a process, the interviewer and the informant bring to light "...the selective, synthetic, and generalizing nature of historical memory itself" (Frisch, 1979, p. 78). Teachers are challenged to examine their own assumptions and biases about history in light of the interactive process required by oral history interviewing Rather than seeing the informant's narrative as a self-evident objective historical record, Frisch argues that the true result of oral history is the ways in which memory mediates culture. We view past time selectively, and all our memories are filtered through the attitudes and judgements we have developed from a recollected past point in time up to the present. In Frisch's eyes, teachers who argue that their students are gathering "just the facts" objectively are misguided, and are missing the interactive reconstruction of the past which takes place in every interview dialogue. Likewise, the teachers who view oral history as just another research tool and who contend it is scientifically less valid than the content analysis of documents also fail to understand the nature of oral history. Frisch challenges both the view that oral history is "more history" and that it is scientifically weak, thus representing "no history." Given that all history is a retrospective endeavor, memory emerges as a basic element in all historical understanding. The intermingling of cultural perceptions about the past with one's memories leads inevitably to the mediation of <u>what was</u> by <u>what is</u>. Oral history about Vietnam represents an amalgam of past recollections of attitudes and events filtered through current cultural perceptions of that conflict. In this way oral history is an amalgam of past and present, with no pretensions to being "self-evident"

history except in the minds of practicioners who don't understand the interplay of memory and cultural forms (Frisch, 1981).

Teachers can use oral history to define and interpret consciousness of informants about the past, a goal which can have important implications in the social studies. In ethnic studies, teachers can engage students in the study of how ethnic groups view their own past through oral history. This does not necessarily mean a "celebration" on one's heritage. Rather, interviews can be approached dialectically, as a process of constant negotiation and change between interviewer and informant. The process can include the introduction of topics by the interviewer in the dialogue which require the informant to judge and reflect upon disquieting or suppressed aspects of the past. More importantly, the interviewer can focus his topical sequence and questions on concepts which are connected to ethnicity, but which may not be prominent in the informant's consciousness or frame of reference. Class, gender, and work are categories that serve as springboards for questions which help the interviewer and the informant cooperate in the creative reconstruction of what Tamke labels subjective and idiosyncratic "experience." Tamke sees such experience arising in the individual's consciousness, and being shared and understood as it is communicated during the interview dialogue (Tamke, 1977).

Teachers must also address the vision of society within which their pedagogy is embedded. If educators employing oral history believe that it has some beneficial value for students, it is legitimate to ask how such benefits are linked to the educator's ideal vision of society. Teachers should critically analyze their beliefs about the

interface of oral history with that vision, specifically when considerable amounts of instructional time are alotted to it. If transmitting the cultural heritage is the professed rationale for using oral history, it may be that the content being transmitted through interviewing is receiving less attention than the fact that students are receiving it. Teaching interviewing, transcribing, and magazine production skills should be done in conjunction with n ongoing concern for the representativeness and truthfulness of the cultural heritage being gathered.

It also seems likely that because a particular group's heritage is being stressed, proportionately less concern is devoted to how the future of that group is being shaped by societal trends, or how that group is connected to other constituencies in society. The focus of the 1970s "ethnic revival" was heavily retrospective, yielding negative implications discussed by more than one critic (Patterson, 1980; Rustin, 1974; Steinberg, 1981). These critics argue that the 1970s (ethnic revival) inspired by a culturally pluralistic vision of society, not only ignored cultural and demographic changes in America, but disguised more pressing concerns and potentially positive bonds among disenfranchised and oppressed groups. Steinberg sees the development of a national mass culture and the decline in second and third generation descendents of ethnic allegiance in religious and cultural spheres, as being more indicative of American life than the growth of extroverted ethnic allegiances (i.e., white power). Rustin and Patterson argue that ethnicity, while perceived by many individuals as a characteristic of their cultural identity, fails to permit the development of more fundamental allegiances based on socioeconomic categories

such as wealth, class, and power. Patterson strongly argues that the ethical relativism at the heart of cultural pluralism permits the dominant networks of wealth and power to incite ethnic allegiances among oppressed groups in a divisive fashion; pitting Blacks against Hispancis, and Asians against Anglos when their common class and work status bonds might offer greater opportunities for a collective movement to change society. Given the predominant preference of surveyed instructors for transmission of the cultural heritage, it is legitimate to ask if oral history in their schools serves a counterproductive social function.

These critiques of the culturally pluralistic ethnic vision demand that educators carefully consider the frame of reference employed in oral history instruction. Fostering the transmission of the cultural heritage can produce a heightened awareness for students of their own identity. Yet, if such inquiry is conceived selectively and narrowly, oral history can contribute to the permanence of myths and distortions, aligned with the celebration of ethnic allegiances which dismiss change as an aberration, or which ignore imperatives of class, gender, and race. Ethnic studies programs committed to cultural pluralism may unwittingly fail to question how a group's own cultural and historic consciousness is formed. Students and educators may focus their interview agendas and questions within a frame of reference that is not shared by the informants themselves (Shopes, 1981). Students and teachers may be desirous of locating an "objective" truth about the past that conforms only with the interviewer's idealized notions of history. This approach fails to emphasize how an informant sees his or her own past, or how an informant reconstructs

it. The interplay of memory and cultural forms needs to be dissected, since it may be more important for students and educators to use oral history as a means for illuminating how ethnic consciousness is perceived instead of seeking an "objective" ethnic psst.

Prospects

Most educators who use oral history in the classroom are committed to an active view of students in the learning process. By itself, this is a laudable aim and it meshes well with the affective learnings and cognitive skills and processes models. Students trained in oral history techniques participate in experiences which often have them apply in-school learning in real-life community environments, a form of social studies education justified on both social and psychological grounds (Mehaffy, Atwood, and Nelson, 1981). The use of interviewing with community informants has greater meaning for students since it represents the concrete application of classroom training, thus fulfilling the social participation goal of social studies education (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka, 1980). Similarly, examination and analysis of articles completed by previous student researchers based on oral history can assist in breaking down the authority role of the teacher as the sole dispenser of knowledge. However, such activities must serve only as a prelude to the actual design of research problems, the critical study of sources, and the writing and revision of the student's own paper or project. Foxfire recognizes the need for active student participation throughout the learning process, since "their (Foxfire's) unique strength is not their content ...but manner in which the material has been gathered and the implications of the process" (Mack, 1976, p. 478).

If oral history helps students learn to communicate more effectively while increasing their self-respect and confidence, as well as facilitating intergroup understanding, then the personal-social development of students may well be maximized.

An action learning emphasis can be harmoniously linked to ethnic studies curricula. Initially, the instructor must clarify his or her approach to history and to ethnicity. Once the teacher recognizes why particular content and concepts are being taught, instruction in oral history training procedures can ensue. Illuminating the ethnic consciousness of community residents can be fostered if teachers adopt a flexible conceptual framework about ethnicity, such as that suggested by Fredrik Barth (Barth, 1966). Barth contends that ethnicity exists in three forms: (a) self-professed ethnicity, in which the individual proclaims his cultural heritage by highlighting noticeable traits and customs associated with a definable culture or subculture; (b) categorical ethnicity, in which individuals label other members of society as members of particular ethnic groups to differentiate them from other social groups and organizations; and (c) structural ethnicity, which is the outgrowth of forms of social interaction governed by rules and prescriptions that arise out of interethnic and interracial contact (Barth, 1966, pp. 11-16). The impression engendered by the survey data suggests that ethnic oral history is by and large associated with self-professed ethnicity, meaning that interviews are conducted in an uncritical manner with informants who profess their own ethnic heritage in a historical dimension. However, oral history can also be used to inquire about categorical and structural ethnicity. Students can

be trained to ask questions that inquire into how individuals perceive other members of the community, perhaps regarding conflict situations such as those generated by segregation, violence, or protest. Indirect cues concerning stereotypical perceptions of minorities can be inserted into student questions to direct the interview dialogue along such lines. Similarly, structural ethnicity can be illuminated through informant/interviewer dialogues that probe the past in terms of intergroup or interracial interaction in common meeting places such as markets, schools, or transportation facilities. Students can interview retail salespersons, managers of stores, teachers, school administrators, and public transportation workers in conjunction with the analysis of racial and cultural attitudes as a means of understanding how contact among groups leads to the development of ethnic perceptions. The structuring of student interview agendas and questions is the key element, but this must be informed by Barth's conceptual framework. Theory from anthropology and social psychology, combined with oral history techniques, can inform a better mode of ethnic oral history in the classroom.

Few if any of the surveys reveal a reading knowledge of either various oral history manuals or studies in history and the social sciences utilizing oral history techniques and evidence. As Shopes and Hareven note, neither volunteer enthusiasm nor significance in the eyes of the researcher are enough to realize one's goals (Hareven, 1978; Shopes, 1981). Teachers need to examine the existing literature on oral history projects and procedures to judge what models are best suited to their situation: history instruction, archival preservation,

affective learnings, cognitive skills and processes, a mixture of these four, or others. For example, is public history an adequate alternative? Howard Green's critique of the burgeoning public history movement suggests that truly popular history should be free of the inbred biases of policy-oriented histories written for corporations, as well as the professional paternalism which academic historians impose on many local history projects staffed by amateurs and archivists (Green, 1981). Teachers who accept funding from the private sector in support of projects and publications can jeopardize opportunities for student investigations, particularly if student research with human informants uncovers unflattering and suppressed aspects of the patron's past. The process of oral history, because it is interactive, entails moral and ethical responsibilities concerning both the search for truth and the rights of the informant to know how and why oral data is being gathered and used. This will be understood only if the instructor is well-read and continues to update his or her knowledge fastidiously.

The interview situation itself is the key in training oral history researchers. Teachers have to decide before they embark on this stage whether the interviewing focus will be on (a) reconstructing informant perceptions, or consciousness, or (b) seeking to corroborate the existing historical record. Two students can interview the same informant about the same topic, but with different purposes in mind. One student asks questions to gain a sense of how the informant reconstructs his past and how memory is integrated with cultural symbols and

themes of more recent vintage. This student is seeking to know how the informant's perceptions represent what the informant believes the past was like. The other student desires very precise and ordered data on specific events in the informant's life, the overall goal being to place that person's life within a larger historical context. Essentially, this student wants to know how the informant's life was indicative of the historical record, or how it varied from general historical trends. Both are legitimate approaches and the instructor must differentiate them by focusing on how each can be employed in the interview situation. With student number one, the teacher can use Hareven's example of how every generation reinterprets the past in light of contemporary forces in society, stressing how "we are now engaged in recovering generational memory, after much of it had been wiped out in a century-long effort to assimilate immigrants" (Hareven, 1978, p. 147). Hareven argues it is important to use oral history to find out how people perceive their own past, instead of perpetuating myths and distortions related to others' perceptions of a group's past. In the second case, ethnic oral history is gathered to supplement the existing store of sources and to complement a grand perspective on history with an intimate one (Allen and Montell, 1982; Raphael, 1977). Both the history of consciousness and the focus on "more history" can coexist in the same interview situation, but for the purposes of instructional clarity it is appropriate to separate them when training student interviewers.

Evaluation also must be addressed. The question What is the value of using oral history in the classroom? should be asked fre-

quently and seriously. Oral history's value is not self-evident, a claim which has been made by more than one advocate of this technique (Frisch, 1981). Given the large amounts of time used for training, teachers must assess what they are doing against some set of reasonable criteria. Moss offers sets of questions for evaluation of interview content, conduct of the interview, and regarding projects themselves. (Moss, 1977). As the interviewing process ensues, students and teachers should discuss the pros and cons of the data-gathering process, particularly when dealing with student frustrations in achieving their own research goals. Listening to completed tapes, reviewing student questioning techniques, and videotaping practice interciew situations to provide feedback on non-verbal cues are helpful strategies for this section of the evaluation process. Consistent review and comparison of completed tapes with successful interviews can highlight the discrepancies between student goals in interviews and the type of content actually gathered. Finally, judgements about the continuation of particular aspects of projects, such as transcribing, indexing, and editing, should be made in light of whether such processes actually contribute to learning the professed goals of the curriculum, and if such processes are facilitating public use of the completed tapes for research and study.

In a time of fiscal exigency in many schools, students who previously were trained to actively interview informants, transcribe and edit tapes, and publish magazines based on interviews no longer are capable of doing so. Teachers who desire to retain the use of oral history in conjunction with ethnic studies can turn to the analysis of interviews completed by others, combined with reading and analysis

of transcripts, books, or articles utilizing interview excerpts. This approach disengages the students from action learning experiences, but offers advantages in maximizing time for students to do content analyses of ethnic group perceptions of personal life experiences. The comparison of informant perceptions of ethnic life to those presented in standard history or sociology textbooks can be a very illuminating process, as can the same process applied to the study of work and industrialism (Manchester Polytechnic, 1980; Wright, Note 1).

The use of oral history as an instructional technique is a complex and often difficult process. When linked to ethnic studies concepts and content, the potential for significant social studies learnings does exist. Social studies educators who are thoughtful and reflective advocates of oral history in the classroom need to reexamine their personal agendas and rationales for its use in light of the trends, problems, and suggestions highlighted here in the hope of improving classroom practice.

Reference Notes

Wright, G. Using oral documents to teach ethnic history at the high school level: the early twentieth century black migratory experience as an example. Paper presented at the 67th annual convention of the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, Inc., October 1982.

Woburn High School Seniors, Class of 1976. Who Are You? Reflections of Italo-Americans. Woburn, Mass.: Woburn Senior High School, 1976.

Woburn High School Seniors, Class of 1977. The Italo-American Experience. Woburn, Mass.: Woburn Senior High School, 1977.

REFERENCES

Allen, B. & Montell, W. L. From memory to history: Using oral sources in local historical research. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1981.

Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. Defining the social studies. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Barth, F. (Ed.) Ethnic groups and boundaries. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1966.

Baum, W. Oral history for the local historical society (2nd rev. ed.). Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975.

Benison, S. Reflections on oral history. The American Archivist, 1965, 28(1), 71-77.

Blassingame, J. W. Slave testimony: two centuries of letters, speeches, interviews, and autobiographies. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.

Bruner, J. The process of education (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1977.

Crowder, W. W. An oral history project in the social studies field. Education, 1969, 89, 327-28.

Cutler, W., Echols, S., Gallant, B., & Wiggonton, E. Oral history as a teaching tool. The Oral History Review, 1973, 28-47.

Dewey, J. The child and the curriculum. In M. S. Dworkin (Ed.), Dewey on Education: Selections. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959. (Originally published, 1902.)

Fenton, E. Developing a new curriculum: A rationale for the Holt social studies curriculum. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Frisch, M. Oral history and hard times: a review essay. The Oral History Review, 1979, 70-79. (Originally published, 1972.)

Frisch, M., & Watts, D. L. Oral history and the presentation of class consciousness: The New York Times versus the Buffalo unemployed. International Journal of Oral History, 1981, 1(2), 88-110.

Frisch, M. The memory of history. Radical History Review, 1981, 25, 9-23.

Green, H. A critique of the professional public history movement. Radical History Review, 1981, 25, 164-171.

Haas, J. D. The era of the new social studies. Boulder: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, Inc, 1977.

Hackney Workers Education Association. Working Lives: Volume One, 1905-1945. London: Centreprise Publishing Project, no date.

Hamilton, S. F. Adolescents in community settings: what is to be learned? Theory and Research in Social Education, 1981, 9(2), 23-38.

Hareven, T. K. The search for generational memory: tribal rites in industrial society. Daedalus, 1978, 107, 137-149.

Hareven, T. K., & Langenbach, R. Amoskeag: life and work in an American factory-city. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1978.

Hatcher, B. Cultural journalism publications. Social Education, 1980, 44(1), 48-51.

Hayden, R. C. (Ed.) A dialogue with the past: oral history accounts of Boston's ethnic neighborhoods and people. Newton, Mass.: Education Development Center, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 451)

Ilisevich, R. D. Oral history in undergraduate research. The History Teacher, 1972, 5, 47-50.

Kachaturoff, G. & Greenebaum, F. Oral history in the social studies classroom. The Social Studies, 1981, 72, 18-21.

Kownslar, A. O. Teaching American history: the quest for relevancy. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1974.

Lichtman, A. J. Your family history. New York: Vintage Books, Inc. 1978.

Lynd, A. & Lynd, S. Rank and file: personal histories by working class organizers. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

Mack, D. Book reviews. (Review of The Foxfire Book, Foxfire 2, Foxfire 3, Moments: The Foxfire Experience, and You and Aunt Arie: A Guide to Cultural Journalism Based on Foxfire and Its descendants in the U. S. and Abroad). Harvard Educational Review, 1976, 46(3), 477-80.

Manchester Polytechnic Institute. Hurrah for a life in the factory: experiences of life in the Lancashire cotton towns before the first world war. Manchester, England: Manchester Polytechnic, 1980.

Mazuzan, G. & Twomey, G. Oral history in the classroom. The Social Studies 1977, 68(1), 14-19.

Mehaffy, G., Atwood, V. R., & Nelson, M. Action learning in social studies. In H. D. Mehlinger and O. L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), The social studies: 80th yearbook of the national society for the study of education (Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Mehaffy, G., Sitton, T., & Davis, O. L., Jr. Oral history in the classroom. How to do it series (Series 2, No. 8) Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1979.

Meyer, B. (Ed.) & Others. Kaleidoscope 20: oral history in the classroom. Boston: Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Division of Curriculum Instruction, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 485)

Montell, W. L. The saga of Coe Ridge: a study in oral history. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970.

Morrissett, I., Superka, D., & Hawke, S. Recommendations for improving social studies in the 1980s. Social Education, 1980, 44(7), 570-76.

Morrissey, C. T. Oral history as a classroom tool. Social Education, 1968, 32, 546-49.

Morrissey, C. T. Public historians and oral history: problems of concept and methods. The Public Historian, 1980, 2(2), 22-29.

Moss, W. W. Oral history program manual. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Moss, W. W. Oral history: an appreciation. The American Archivist, 1977, 40(4), 429-39.

The projects. Nameless Newsletter, 1977, 1(1 and 2), 21-26.

Nee, V. G. & Nee, B. D. Long time californ! New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1973.

Nelson, M. & Singleton, H. W. Using oral history in the social studies classroom. Clearing House, 1975, 49, 89-93.

Newton, R. F. Oral history: using the school as an historical institution. Clearing House, 1974, 47, 73-78.

Patterson, O. Ethnic chauvinism. New York: Stein & Day, 1977.

Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education. Oral history: what? why? how? guidelines for oral history. Harrisubrg: Bureau of Curriculum Services, 1975.

Perdue, C. What's wrong with Foxfire. Nameless Newsletter, 1979, 2(2), 29-31.

Peterson, P. The Foxfire concept. Media and Methods, 1973, 16-18.

Purkis, S. Oral history in schools. Manchester, England: Progress Books and the Oral History Society, 1980.

Raphael, M. L. Oral history in an ethnic community: the problems and the promise. Ohio History, 1977, 86, 248-257.

Rustin, B. Ethnics: a new separatism. American Federationist, December 1974, 8-11.

San Francisco Public Library. Collecting local history: proceedings of a workshop held March 16 and 17, 1977 at the San Leandro community library center. San Francisco, Calif.: Bay Area Reference Center, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 150 060)

Shopes, L. The Baltimore neighborhood heritage project: oral history and community involvement. Radical History Review, 1981, 25, 27-44.

Spade, B. Americans in Vietnam: an oral history project. The History Teacher, 1975, 8, 183-192.

Starr, L. M. Oral history. In Kent, Lancour, & Daily (Eds.), Encyclopedia of library and information science (Vol. 20).

Steinberg, S. The ethnic myth. New York: Atheneum, 1981.

Sullivan, M. Into community classrooms: another use for oral history. The Oral History Review, 1974, 53-58.

Superka, D., S. Hawke, & Morrissett, I. The current and future status of the social studies. Social Education, 1980, 44(5), 362-69.

Tamke, S. S. Oral history and popular culture: a method for the study of the experience of culture. Journal of Popular Culture, 1977, 11(3), 267-79.

Thompson, P. The voice of the past: oral history. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Whistler, N. Colorado oral history projects: a directory. Denver: Denver Public Library, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 152 641)

Wiggonton, E. (Ed.) The Foxfire book. New York: Doubleday, 1972.

Wiggonton, E. Moments. Moments: The Foxfire Experience, 1975, 3(1).

Wiggonton, E. Foxfire 5. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

Wood, P. You and aunt Arie: a guide to cultural journalism based on Foxfire and its descendants in the U. S. and abroad. Washington, D. C.: IDEAS, 1975.

SURVEY FORM

Name of respondent:_____(PLEASE PRINT)

Title of course taught in which oral history is employed in conjunction with ethnic studies:_____

Name of school in which this course is taught:_____

Address of school:_____

_____State_____Zip_____

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. For all questions which require a narrative response, please write or print as legibly as possible in the space provided. If you require additional space to answer a question, continue on the reverse side of the same sheet.

2. For all questions which desire the selection of one answer from among various alternatives, please mark one answer. This should be the best and most applicable alternative. Make your mark clear and legible.

QUESTIONS

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have at the present time?

   a. 1-3 years b. 4-6 years c. 7-9 years d. 10-12 years

   e. 13-15 years f. 16 or more years

2. Indicate your sex.

   a. Male b. Female

3. What is your current position in the school? (Indicate that which most readily applies based on the amount of time you devote to that role.)

   a. Teacher b. Instructional aide c. Department chairperson

   d. College/University faculty member e. Full-time graduate student

   f. Part-time graduate student g. Unemployed h. Other_____

   (If you marked h for question #3, please specify in the space provided.)

4. How many years have you employed oral history as an instructional technique? (If you have done so for parts of a year, give a reasonable approximation.)

   a. less than one year b. 1-2 years c. 3-4 years

   d. 5-6 years e. 7-8 years f. 9-10 years g. 11 or more years

5. In what area of the school curriculum is the course employing oral history encompassed?

   a. Social studies b. English/language arts c. Journalism

   d. Bilingual/bicultural studies e. Foreign languages

   f. Cross-disciplinary/interdisciplinary courses g. Fine arts

   h. Vocational i. Other_____

   (Indicate the particular course/curricular title if you marked i for the answer to question #5.)

6. How many weeks in the school calendar does this course last?

   a. 1-4 weeks b. 5-8 weeks c. 9-12 weeks d. 13-16 weeks

   e. 17-20 weeks f. 21-24 weeks g. 25-28 weeks

   h. 29-32 weeks i. 33 or more weeks

7. How many weeks do you devote to the use of oral history as an instructional technique? Write in your best estimate in the space provided.

   _____

8. Does your use of oral history comprise a major element of this course?

   a. Yes b. No c. It is equal in importance to other elements.

9. Do students in this course read how-to-do-it manuals, or excerpts from such manuals prior to doing oral history interviews? (How-to-do-it manuals refer to oral history training manuals.)

   a. Yes b. No

10. If you answered "yes" (alternative a) to question #9, please provide the title of the manual(s) and the author(s) in the space shown below.

Title of manual:_____

Author:_____

Title of manual:_____

Author:_____

11. Place an X next to each of the training procedures listed below which your students engage in prior to actual interviews with informants.
MARK AS MANY OF THE ALTERNATIVES AS ARE APPLICABLE TO YOUR COURSE.

_____ a. Read and discuss sources on how to interview.

_____ b. Read and discuss sources on how to transcribe interview tapes.

_____ c. Read and discuss sources on how to index taped interviews.

_____ d. Read and discuss sources on how to edit taped interviews.

_____ e. Read and discuss completed transcripts of earlier interviews.

_____ f. Read and discuss existing books/articles based on oral history research (Examples-Terkel's Hard Times, Hareven's Amoskeag.)

_____ g. Listen to and discuss earlier tapes of oral history interviews.

_____ h. Practice questioning techniques.

_____ i. Practice fielding responses of informants.

_____ j. Practice usage of non-verbal cues.

_____ k. Practice transcribing of oral history interviews.

_____ l. Practice indixing of oral history interviews.

_____ m. Practice editing of oral history transcripts.

_____ n. Discuss the use of release forms and other legal considerations connected with interviewing of human subjects.

_____ e. Practice contacting informants.

_____ p. Examine and discuss the operation of tape recorders and tapes.

_____ q. Read and discuss the future uses of completed tapes and related information (i.e., release forms, transcripts).

_____ r. Role-play interviews with practice informants.

_____ s. Read and discuss problems which arise in interviewing situations.

_____ t. Do background research in other documents and artifacts prior to interviewing informants.

_____ u. Other (Please describe or list these specifically.)

_____

_____

_____

12. Place an X next to each of the activities listed below which your students engage in after the interviews have been completed. MARK AS MANY OF THE ALTERNATIVES AS ARE APPLICABLE TO YOUR COURSE.

_____ a. Students listen to and critique completed student interview tapes.

_____ b. Students read and critique completed indices of interview tapes.

_____ c. Students read and critique completed transcripts of interview tapes.

_____ d. Students evaluate the worth of oral history as an instructional technique.

_____ e. Informants are encouraged to offer suggestions and critiques of interviews.

_____ f. Other school personnel are encouraged to evaluate the worth of oral history as an instructional technique.

_____ g. Students evaluate the worth of tapes and related documents from previous years as source materials for research.

_____ h. Students compare their taped interviews with existing documents on the same topic to evaluate the interview's value as a source of data on their research topic.

_____ i. Other (Please describe or list these specifically.)

_____

_____

_____

13. Do you maintain an archive of completed interview tapes?

a. Yes b. No

14. If you answered "yes" (alternative a) to question #13, describe where and in what manner the completed tapes are stored and catalogued. Information on access for listening to the tapes is particularly helpful.

15. Five predominant rationales for the inclusion of social studies in the school curriculum are presented below. Mark the rationale which in your opinion is most effectively served by the use of oral history in your particular course. (If you mark "Other," alternative f, please specify.)

Five Social Studies Rationales[1]

_____ a. Transmission of Selected Aspects of the Cultural Heritage

_____ b. Introduction and Training in the Social Science Disciplines

_____ c. Development of Reflective Thinking or Inquiry Skills

_____ d. Develop Students as Social Critics and Social Activists

_____ e. Development of Personal-Social Understanding of Students

_____ f. Other (specify below)

[1] Excerpted from Jack L. Nelson and John U. Michaelis, Secondary Social Studies: Instruction, Curriculum, Evaluation, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980), pp. 12-13.

16. What additional goals do you believe are achieved by the use of oral history techniques? Please list them.

17. Does the course in which you employ oral history emphasize content and concepts about ethnic studies?

    a. Most of the time b. More than one-half the time

    c. Less than one-half the time d. Hardly at all

18. If your answer to question #17 was either alternative a or b, please explain how you use studies content and concepts in conjunction with oral history techniques.

    Example - Interviews by students of a given ethnic group with elderly residents of local ethnic groups enhance student awareness of their own cultural heritage.

19. Based upon your experiences, what has been the most worthwhile outcome of the use of oral history in conjunction with ethnic studies content and concepts?

20. Based upon your experiences, what has been the least worthwhile outcome of the use of oral history in conjunction with ethnic studies concepts and concepts?

21. If you publish a magazine or book containing research based on oral history/ethnic studies interviews, please indicate its title and beginning and continuing dates of publication.

Title:_____

Initial date of publication (first issue):_____Yr._____

Most recent issue: _____ Yr._____

22. In what other forms have you made your students' research and interviewing results known to the general public? Please explain.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR EFFORTS IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY. PLEASE RETURN IT IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE THAT HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR YOUR USE.